DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 607 FL 009 188

AUTHOR Sajavaara, Kari
TITLE Contrastive Linguistics Past and Present and a Communicative Approach. Contrastive Papers: Jyvaskyla Contrastive Studies, 4. Reports from the Department of English, No. 4.
INSTITUTION Jyvaskyla Univ. (Finland). Dept. of English.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communicative Competence (Languages); *Contrastive Linguistics; Discourse Analysis; Error Analysis (Language); Interference (Language Learning); Language Fluency; *Language Instruction; Language Skills; Linguistic Competence; Linguistic Performance; *Linguistic Theory; Pragmatics; Second Language Learning; Structural Linguistics
IDENTIFIERS Europe; United States

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews the history of contrastive analysis (CA) against the background of its objectives and its present problems and presents an outline of procedures which seem to be necessary to make the methods meet the objectives of applied CA. CA in the United States was closely connected with structuralism, which was an obvious cause for later criticism. The culminating point came at the Georgetown Roundtable in 1968, after which American CA slowly died out. Interest was revived in Europe, however, particularly in Germany, Poland, Yugoslavia, Romania, and Hungary. The main areas of CA which have caused criticism are the following: (1) relevance for language teaching; (2) structuralism and CA; (3) the turmoil in the theory of grammar; (4) the theory and methodology of CA; and (5) the nature of the criticism. CA must be expanded beyond contrasting grammatical elements to contrasting elements of communicative competence. The communicative approach in language teaching necessarily leads to contrastive discourse analysis. CA will have to be expanded in the following areas: (1) linguistic research (in phonetics, syntax, semantics, lexicon, text); (2) psycholinguistic research; and (3) contrastive sociolinguistic studies. (Author/CFM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kari Sajavaara

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED1496.07

CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS PAST AND PRESENT AND A COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH

KARI SAJAVAARA
University of Jyväskylä

INTRODUCTION

Since the adoption of the term 'contrastive linguistics' to describe a certain type of comparison between two or more languages, this field of linguistic analysis has been subjected to both great expectations and severe criticism.[1] Most of the recent literature concerning contrastive analysis (CA) gives the impression that contrastive linguistics is in the grip of a severe crisis after a boom in the early 1960s. Yet the crisis, if there is one, exists at the level of theoretical discussion only, and contrastive linguistics has progressed rapidly at various centres of active research.

The 'crisis' is at least partly due to a paradox between the theoretical basis of CA and its objectives. As an explanation of this paradox, reference can be made to the past history of CA. In this paper, an attempt is made to review the history of CA against the background of its objectives and its present problems and to present an outline of procedures which seem to be necessary to make the methods meet the objectives of applied CA. Pragmatic and communicative criteria will be introduced for this purpose.

CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS PAST AND PRESENT

The history of CA remains to be written. Only a number of highly cursory discussions are available (Di Pietro 1971:vii-xv, 9-12, Fisiak 1975, Rusiecki 1976, Jackson 1976); these sketches give only a pale reflection of the work of the past decade for the reason that these histories mostly stop at the Georgetown Round Table Conference devoted to CA (Alatis (ed.) 1968) and the active research into CA in Europe is not given the attention which it deserves. In the same way, the work being done in a number of Eastern European countries is neglected in general summaries and criticisms of CA (e.g. Corder 1975, Dirven 1976, Sander

[1] A slightly different Finnish version of this paper has appeared in Sajavaara (ed.) 1977.

FL00 9188

1976). Only exceptionally do the writers accomplish more than mere listing of the projects; the material concerning the objectives and results will have to be collected from a number of conference reports (particularly Filipović (ed.) 1971, Chitoran (ed.) 1976) or reports on specific contrastive problems in the series published by various projects. CA had a twin starting-point, although this has not always been recognized. This concerns both the contrastive type of linguistic analysis at the turn of the century and in the thirties (see Fisiak 1975:341), and the beginnings of modern CA in the forties (Fries 1945, Trager 1949). The theoretical objectives were almost entirely forgotten in the wake of Weinreich's (1953) and Lado's (1957) work. For a long time, their idea that learning difficulties are equal to the difference between the systems of the two languages contrasted remained highly influential in contrastive analysis. In addition, Lado's statement (1957:vii) to the effect that patterns which will, or will not, cause difficulty can be predicted and described "by comparing systematically the language and culture to be learned with the native language and the culture of the student" (which was later to be called the Strong Hypothesis for CA) may be considered as one of the primary causes of the controversy which ensued in the 1960s. Today, twenty years later, it is rather difficult to see the point in Lado's blue-eyed optimism and one can even venture to express the doubt that Lado never intended his remark to be taken as categorically as some critics of CA have taken it; it is to be remembered, however, that, in the late fifties, modern sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics did not exist. Lado's emphasis on the comparison of cultures was mostly forgotten; yet it is there that we can find a clue for a modern revision of the contrastive hypothesis. Side by side with cultural contrasts Lado also stressed the importance of the psychological aspects of language learning.

The early stages of modern contrastive linguistics can be connected with the American type of structuralism, which is another obvious cause for later criticism. The culminating point was, on the one hand, the publication of the Contrastive Structure Series in 1962-1965 and, on the other, the Georgetown Round Table Conference in 1968. The Contrastive Structure Series was primarily designed to help the language teacher in his problems. The volumes which were published reflect the transfer in linguistics from pure structuralism over to transformational grammar. It is ominous in a sense that to this day the CSS volumes remain the last

The Hungarian project has expanded rapidly in the last few years: the approach is eclectic (see Dezsö and Stephanides 1976). Problems of theory and methodology have attracted quite a lot of attention in Yugoslavia and Romania but so far the results have been fairly traditional.

No 'complete' contrastive grammar has been published. The introductory Polish-English contrastive grammar, which is in press in Poland, is primarily a textbook of contrastive linguistics based on TG (Fisiak et al. 1975). The book by Burgschmidt and Götz (1974) is, despite its name, a general introduction to CA, not a German-English grammar (see James 1976).

Several new projects have been started in the 1970s. The Swedish-English contrastive studies project (SECS) in Lund concentrated on error analysis. Analyses with English have also been launched in Jyväskylä (Finnish), Copenhagen (Danish), and Leuven (French). All of these apply eclectic methodology and aim at practical ends. An important centre in the field is the Mannheim Institute of the German language, where German is contrasted with French, Spanish, and Japanese, among others (Stickel 1976).

Most of the introductory material on CA is available in a number of conference reports (e.g. Alatis (ed.) 1968, Filipović (ed.) 1971, Nickel (ed.) 1971, 1974, Chitoran (ed.) 1976). Di Pietro made an attempt to review contrastive linguistics for pedagogical purposes on the basis of TG (Di Pietro 1971); for applied purposes the book contains only rather scanty material. Krzeszowski's contrastive generative grammar (1974) is an important landmark in the history of contrastive theory formation; it leads the way towards still deeper CA. By the mid-seventies, a clear picture of the influence of TG grammar on contrastive analysis has developed (see Lipińska 1975). Several TG problems have proved fruitful from the theoretical point of view while the number of practical applications has remained small (see van Buren 1976, Kohn 1976). For the time being at least, it is too early to tell if a TG approach to CA will be any more fruitful for applied purposes than structuralism. The major reason for this may be the simple fact that applications of linguistics are not really possible unless the study starts from the problems and tries to find out if there is anything in linguistics that might be useful in solving them. Purity of theory is thus secondary.

The literature concerning CA is vast. The most recent bibliography (Sajavaara and Lehtonen (ed.) 1975)contains some 1,000 titles for the pe-

'complete' contrastive presentations of any two languages and that the studies between English and French and between English and Russian were never published.

The Georgetown conference struck the heaviest note of criticism and for many people this note seems to have subsisted as the last word about CA; in most cases the criticism has been accepted without further considering the development which led to it. The Georgetown conference also introduced error analysis (EA) as a 'contestant' to CA. The discussion which follows is unnecessarily garbled by views which see these two types of analysis as opponents. The re-evaluation of CA went on at the Pacific Conference on Contrastive Linguistics and Language Universals, which was held in Hawaii in 1971 (see Whitman and Jackson (ed.) 1971).

While American contrastive linguistics slowly died out as a result of severe criticism, the interest in this area of linguistic study was revived in Europe. The German-English PAKS in Kiel, later in Stuttgart, the Polish-English project in Poznań, the Serbo-Croatian-English project in Zagreb, the Romanian-English project in Bucharest and the Hungarian-English in Budapest (see Filipović (ed.) 1971) were launched in the mid-sixties. All of the projects initially announced pedagogical applications as their major objective; from the very beginning, however, the research carried out under their auspices covered widely different areas. The PAKS project concentrated on the problems of applying transformational-generative grammar to CA (König 1971); after some promising work the project was discontinued due to a lack of funds. The Polish project has been highly productive (see Kawińska (ed.) 1976). It has orientated towards the more theoretical aspects of CA – for the past five years within the framework of generative semantics. Pedagogical applications are few in number.

The Zagreb project aims at more practical objectives, which is reflected in a separate pedagogical reports series (e.g. Filipović (ed.)1974) In the beginning, the results – as voluminous as those of the Polish project – were rather conventional as a result of a close adherence to a translation corpus but more recently the analysis has followed developments in linguistic theory more closely (Filipović 1976). From the very beginning the Roman-English project sought ways of avoiding the traditional contrasting of structures and has approached error analysis with psycholinguistic starting-points (Slama-Cazacu 1971a, 1974, Chitoran 1976).

riod of the past ten years, and the bibliography is by no means exhaustive. There also exists a recent bibliography of error analysis (Palmberg (ed.) 1976).

Traditional CA is characterized by the methodological principle that the structure of the languages to be contrasted will have to be descibed first by means of one and the same theoretical model, and these descriptions are then contrasted for the specification of similarities and dissimilarities. In most cases, the procedure is one of the following five (see, e.g. Kühlwein 1975:85-86): (1) the same categories of the two languages are contrasted; (2) the equivalents for a certain category of the target language are sought in the source language; (3) rules or hierarchies of rules in the two languages are compared; (4) the analysis starts from a semantic category whose surface realizations are sought in the languages to be contrasted; and (5) the analysis starts from various uses of language.

REASONS FOR THE 'CRISIS' OF CA

Despite the fact that most of the literature criticizing CA derives its information from dated material, it is quite evident today that traditional CA has been unable to solve the problems which have been set for applied CA. Most of the criticism centres round the papers presented at the Georgetown conference and takes its driving force from the strong hypothesis of CA. As late as the mid-seventies, there still appear reviews of CA in which post-Georgetown developments have been disregarded (see e.g. Sanders 1976, Dirven 1976). James's paper (1971) refutes most of the points taken up in the criticism in the 1960s. More attention should however be paid to criticism which starts from the fact that an important part of CA has been much too abstract as compared to its objectives (Slama-Cazacu 1971, Bausch 1973).

The reasons for criticism can be found in the history of CA, in the heterogeneous nature of the criticism itself, in the theoretical and methodological problems of CA, and in the general problems of linguistic theory. The areas causing criticism can be classified in the following way:

(1) relevance for language teaching:
    (a) the predictive nature of CA;
    (b) language teaching methodology and CA;

(2) structuralism and CA;
(3) the turmoil in the theory of grammar;
(4) the theory and methodology of CA:
    (a) the problem of equivalence;
    (b) the theory of transfer;
    (c) the independence of linguistic descriptions;
    (d) the abstract nature of the analysis;
    (e) the static nature of the analysis;
(5) the nature of the criticism

It is somehow contradictory that at the same time as CA is severely criticized it appeals to more and more research-workers all over the world. Each one of the above points will be discussed separately below.

Relevance for language teaching. – The first phase of CA in the United States can be connected with objectives relevant for language teaching, as implied by the first statements by Fries (1945). In most cases, however, traditional CA produced results which were either platitudes known to every experienced language teacher or such abstract contrasts that their application for language teaching purposes seemed fruitless. Most of the results were of the type which could be revealed easily by means of error analysis, and it is not surprising that proponents of EA were able to gain ground. This resulted in a lengthy discussion about which of the two should be preferred to the other or which of the two should be subordinated to the other – whether CA is subsidiary to EA or the other way round. To a certain extent, the distinction between the 'strong' and 'weak' hypotheses of CA cleared the air (Wardhaugh 1970), but by the end of the 1970s it has become quite evident that linguistic CA cannot solve all the problems of language learning because not all of them are linguistic.

The obvious connection of CA with the mother tongue of language learners produced another point of criticism because in this way CA was seen to conflict with the audio-lingual method of language teaching. The conflict derives from a misconception about the role of CA in the service of language teaching: applied CA does not necessarily mean that CA is taken to the classroom. The idea that a bilingual method automatically means the acceptance of contrastive methodology is also wrong: bilingual teaching does not necessarily imply CA; in superficial contrasting it may even be misleading.

Structuralism and CA. – The early phases of CA are closely related to American structuralism, and many of the early contrastive analyses were written under the influence of the Bloomfieldian type of structuralism. Structuralism lays a strong emphasis on differences between languages, and when it became evident that CA cannot concentrate on distinctions alone but should pay attention to similarities, structuralism turned out to be a rather odd bedfellow. It is worth pointing out in this context, however, that American structuralism, as advocated by Sapir and Whorf, also sowed the seeds of the research on language universals. Since it was considered essential for successful CA that the two languages were first described in terms of one and same model and structuralism, for its part, concentrated on features which were language-specific, it was not surprising that structural CA could not succeed in meeting the applied objectives.

The turmoil in the theory of grammar. – The history of contrastive linguistics shows that the descriptions of individual languages which have been adopted for CA have changed in accordance with the development of linguistic theory. This is, for instance, reflected in the Contrastive Structure Series, where the structuralistic approach of the early analyses is replaced by a TG model in the later ones. Several of the projects launched in the course of the past ten years have remained eclectic without adhering too closely to any one of the existing theoretical models (e.g. the Romanian-English project and the Serbo-Croatian one). The only one which has taken a firm stand in this respect is the Polish-English project, which is based on generative semantics. For theoretical CA it makes no difference which one of the existing models is selected if it fulfils the demands of descriptive adequacy; the best model is obviously the one which explains a wider range of parameters (see Fisiak et al. 1975). This does not necessarily mean, however, that this kind of model serves applied purposes as well.

Today, the problems of syntactic theory are greater than ten years ago, and there are few people today who are willing to predict in which direction syntactic theory will develop in the next few years; there is no generally accepted model for linguistic description, which also implies that there are not (and will not be in the very near future at least)

any complete descriptions of any two languages according to one and the same model. Since it is not possible to make use of descriptions of this kind for CA, the first task awaiting a contrastivist has been the description of the relevant languages, which has been an obvious cause of problems of various kinds.

One more conflicting ingredient was introduced by the realization towards the end of the 1960s of the fact that a sentence which is separated from its context is not an exhaustive starting-point for linguistic discussion.

The theory and methodology of CA. – Discrepancies and contradictions in contrastive methodology have been a self-evident instigator for critics.

(a) Contrastive analysis is mostly built upon *translation equivalence* as established by a bilingual informant. At a crude level of analysis, translation equivalence serves as a satisfactory basis of contrasting but it is not unambiguous as a theoretical concept (see, e.g., Bouton 1976). The interrelationship between form and meaning remains a burning problem despite attempts to solve it (Marton 1968, Krzeszowski 1971, 1974:11-14). There is no safe method for the specification of the surface categories which correspond to certain deep semantic entities (cf. James 1976). What this implies in practice is that contrastive presentations result in parallel descriptions at best of pairs of languages. It does not seem possible to solve these problems before we are able to establish a hierarchy of various grammatical, referential, notional, sociolinguistic and textlinguistic factors necessary for the interpretation of communicative intentions.

(b) Under the influence of Harris (1954), on the one hand, and the psychology of learning, on the other, the *theory of transfer* has played an important role in the development of EA and applied CA. Negative transfer, i.e. interference, is expected to result in erroneous forms in the language of the learner. Similar to the problems connected with translation equivalence, it has proved rather difficult to tell which kind of units and at which level this transfer takes place (see Slama-Cazacu 1971, James 1976). Moreover, it is difficult to draw a boundary between interference proper and various unconscious strategies whose purpose is to make the foreign-language learning task easier (for a thorough discussion of

the problems involved see Kellerman 1977).

(c) The *independence of the descriptions* of structures in two languages, which is considered essential for CA, is illusory only. All major grammatical models have been created in close adherence to descriptions of certain individual languages (see James 1976); describing other languages by using such models already means contrasting of some kind, and the independence of such a description is questionable. How reliable any further contrastive analyses between these languages are remains a serious theoretical problem.

(d) The *abstract nature* of the analysis has always been a fruitful source of criticism. It is obvious that only rarely can a solution to the problems of language teaching be found in CA which is purely linguistic: all the problems are not linguistic. Yet CA can be blamed for its abstract nature (e.g. Slama-Cazacu 1971, Bausch 1973) only if contrastive linguistics is regarded as a field of applied linguistics, and there is no reason to do so. Theoretical contrastive linguistics is clearly a branch of theoretical linguistics. If the area of applied linguistics is expanded to cover the application of a grammatical model to the description of an individual language, most contrastive work falls within this area. It is rather difficult, however, to draw the boundary between theoretical and applied research unless all research with a definite objective outside purely scholarly interests is considered as applied research (see Barrera-Vidal and Kühlwein 1976:7)

Traditional CA has also been too abstract in another sense: it has been too far removed from the reality of a language learner. The research has not started from the problems which a teacher or a learner may have had: applications have been expected to result like parasites from theoretical contrasts (see Sharwood Smith 1975; cf. Bausch and Raabe 1975 and Wilkins 1972). Despite finely formulated objectives, CA has too often become art for art's sake. Contrastive problems have been discussed in a vacuum without any clear link with the problems raised in the statements concerning the objectives, or in many cases theoretical CA, which has an autonomous status as a self-sufficient discipline without any consideration of possible applications, has been made for the purposes of language teaching and has then been criticized for not having applications in language teaching: this kind of criticism has been justified if the contrastivists themselves have been unable to see the distinction

between theoretical and applied CA.

Many theoretical contrastive descriptions are based on models of linguistic competence. Such models have not, however, been designed to predict how this competence is reflected at the performance level of an individual user of the language. For theoretical purposes a descriptive adequacy of the model is necessary: a theoretical analysis can never be eclectic (Fisiak 1975:345). For applied purposes no such preconditions are necessary.

In some models the decoding process of the communication theory has been used to describe the problems of foreign language learning and thereby extended to cover CA (see Chitoran 1970, Nickel 1971). In such models, the contrast between the source language and the target language is seen as a continuous active process which is supposed to be reflected in both the didactic and methodic programming of teaching. This approach does not solve the basic problems connected with the abstract nature of those linguistic descriptions which are not connected to the communicative function.

Applied contrastive linguistics aims at selecting from all the material available the elements which are necessary for a certain specific purpose. In most cases this means that linguistic competence will have to be correlated to performance, the meaningful use of linguistic and other parameters in various communicative tasks. From a contrastive point of view it is important to see what decisions the speaker has to make to produce a foreign-language utterance instead of a native-language one on the basis of one and the same set of concepts and communicative intentions (cf. Marton 1974).

(e) Traditional CA is based on too *static* a view of the inter-lingual contrasts. It is static in a number of ways: (1) The variation of natural languages is disregarded, mainly because the descriptions of individual languages are based on the scholar's competence or normative descriptions. (2) The source language and target language are considered to be equal as far as the student is concerned (see, however, Fisiak 1975). (3) The learner's position in relation to the target language (as well as to the source language) is regarded as stable; yet an elementary learner is in a position different from that of an advanced learner (for an interesting discussion of this distinction as regards the lexicon, see Marton 1977), a child's position is different from that of an adult, etc. While the proficiency in the foreign language increases, the learner's stand in relation to both

languages changes radically. (4) Not much attention has been paid to the roles of the speaker and the hearer and the constant shifting of these roles in a communicative situation. The psychological and neurological aspects of the process of production and that of perception remain unknown for the most part; it seems probable that the theories based on the communication theory which regarded these processes as equivalents of encoding and decoding are not correct. Production and reception cannot be considered reverse processes, mirror images of each other. The native speaker seems to rely on a capacity of prediction which is derived from his experience with the language. Perception actually means parallel construction of the sentence by means of all available cues, both linguistic and non-linguistic.

It is quite evident today that much more attention should be paid to the different roles of the speaker/hearer for the purposes of applied contrastive analysis.

The nature of the criticism. — Most of the criticism of CA has dwelt on the fact that CA has been unable to meet the objectives which were set for it in the fifties. Few critics have stopped to question whether CA was actually able to pinpoint linguistic structures whose analysis would produce desired results. It is clear today that early CA did not meet its objectives, but it is difficult to tell where it really went wrong. What was definitely not wrong was the basic idea of contrasting languages; the evidence of transfer and interference even at a rather superficial level of analysis is so plentiful that it cannot be ignored. If the basic assumption was not wrong, which implies the validity of a contrastive analysis hypothesis, then the source of the problems will have to be sought in the ways and means of carrying out the task of contrasting languages: the only conclusion which can be drawn from a discussion like this is the insufficiency of the study of the linguistic parameters for the solution of the problems which CA was expected to untangle.

In many cases, error analysis was offered as aid in the methodological crisis of CA (see, e.g., Grucza 1976): it was considered either as a replacement for CA or as a primary level of analysis to which CA was to be subordinated. Yet many proponents of EA failed to see that applied CA and EA are both methods whose target is one and the same: the problems

connected with the learner's language. Several scholars interested in this area have expressed the opinion that CA should begin with the investigation of the phenomenon for which it was originally created, i.e. interference (see, e.g. Slama-Cazacu 1971, Bausch 1973). The Romanian-English contrastive project has successfully applied this principle in its contact analysis (see Slama-Cazacu (ed.) 1975).

In the last few years, proponents of error analysis have given up the one-sided description of learners' errors in favour of the study of interlanguage (approximate system). In this way, a rather static basis of analysis has been replaced by an analysis of the processes of language learning; the learner's language is no longer seen as an erroneous form of the language but as an *état de dialecte* (Corder 1972, 1975).

It is certainly wrong to assume that CA and EA are subsidiary to each other or that they only complement one another. Rather, they are two fields of inquiry within a vast entity, the research into the problems of learning strategies. The main emphasis should be put on the whole of the learner's language; CA and AE should be correlated to each other within this framework (they cannot be separated); furthermore, they should be correlated to the general principles of communicative networks.

COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

In the linguistic discussion of the last few years, the original Chomskyan borderline between competence and performance has been disintegrating, mainly under the influence of sociolinguistic research. Linguistic competence – most of the attention has been focused on grammatical competence – is now seen to be a part of a wider entity; the entire communicative behaviour of the human being is now under scrutiny. Emphasis lies on utterances in contexts where they are made (see Campbell and Wales 1970). Grammatical competence has been replaced by communicative competence, which means the ability to communicate verbally and non-verbally in culturally restricted contexts. Furthermore, communicative competence is an element in a wider entity, sociocultural competence (see Dirven et al. 1976:2), but for the purposes of the present discussion this distinction can be disregarded. The same concerns the distinction between communicative competence and communicative behaviour (Piepho 1974:12). (For various terminological and related problems connected with the concept of communicative competence, see Östman and Phillips 1977).

Communicative competence consists of grammatical competence and pragmatics. A major part of linguistic research has so far centred round the problems of grammatical competence involving various aspects of the interrelationship between form and meaning. Communication is a form of social behaviour which cannot be separated from the context where it takes place and where the participants in the communicative act are involved in constant interaction; pragmatics can be considered the set of rules for such an interactional behaviour. It can be likened to a game; language structures correspond to various pieces and the rules to rules of the game:

> Speech communication is a series of events resembling a game in which each time we make a move we have to produce for ourselves the piece we intend to move. It is difficult to tell what is more important in the game: if we do not know the pieces used in the game (recognize phonemes of a foreign language in speech), we cannot interpret the moves of our opponent even if we know the rules of the game; if we are not acquainted with the rules of the game (for instance, the phonological structure of words in the language), the mere skill of recognizing the characteristics of the pieces is not sufficient; if we are not able to shape our pieces so that the opponent can recognize our moves, it will be difficult for our opponent to grasp the meaning of our intention in the game. Just like the game of chess, speech communication is a game played by two people whose respective moves always take place in response to those of the fellow player. In a speech game it is equally important for us to understand what our fellow speaker means by what he says as it is for the speaker of a foreign language to understand the meaning of our message. The purpose of the speech game is not however to checkmate the opponent.(Lehtonen, Sajavaara and May 1977:12.)

In communicative situations, the pragmatics, i.e. the rules of the game, consist of various parameters related to psycholinguistics (e.g., the attitudes of the speaker and the hearer and possible third parties towards the speech situation), to social psychology (e.g., the roles of the participants), and to sociolinguistics (e.g., various norms involved). In interactional behaviour it is necessary for the participants to recognize and heed each other's communicative intentions. Communicative behaviour is based on a number of rules, 'conversational postulates', which are seldom ignored (see Grice 1975, Gordon and Lakoff 1975, Lakoff 1972). For the time being, we have not yet got enough information about the relevance of all the different parameters which are present at a communicative act (see in particular Golopentia-Eretescu 1974). The following list is not exhaustive: speaker, hearer, time and place, code (broken down to various components), channel, various prerequisites of the speaker-hearer

(knowledge of the world, knowledge of the other parties of the speech event, social relationships and roles, including various rules of politeness and hierarchies, norms, understanding of earlier messages, most of which is normally covered by the concept of presupposition), intentions of the speaker and the hearer, affective states, non-verbal elements of the communicative act, and problem-solving capacity (see Wunderlich 1971, Dirven and Radden 1976:63, Fawcett 1973:8, Baur et al. 1975, Hennig and Huth 1975). In many cases, the verbal part of the message may be so garbled that it remains unintelligible to persons who are not acquainted with at least the majority of the parameters listed above.

The communicative approach has meant that language is no longer studied as a 'grammar', abstract, divorced from its user, but is approached as a means of human interaction. In this respect, language follows the same rules as other types of behaviour, and the description of how people use language will have to be correlated to our knowledge of man's overall cognitive behaviour and perceptive capacities. For language teaching, the communicative approach has meant the connection of linguistic elements with meaningful speech acts and with contexts where speech acts are made. Today it is also clear that the situational approach to language teaching does not really mean any thorough change in the grammatical and audiolingual method unless some sort of a notional or functional system is introduced at the same time. The speech acts will have to be connected with contexts, but a lot of research is needed in the ordering of various notional, referential, sociolinguistic and contextual factors.

The communicative behaviour of a speaker of a foreign language could be viewed through the concept of 'fluency', which is often used to describe the high-level performance of a good foreign-language learner and which is often, wrongly, connected with the production of a certain rate of speech. Criteria such as lack of hesitation and pauses, length of sentences, absence of errors, etc. are also often mentioned, but there is no scientific definition of fluency (see, however, Leeson 1975).

Fluency cannot however be approached from the speaker's point of view alone: the communicative situation will have to be observed as an entity in which the hearer has an important function. The speaker's performance is conditioned by the hearer's performance, i.e. the linguistic and other cues the latter receives from the speaker or independently brings into the communicative act; is also conditioned by the alternation of the roles of

speaker and hearer between the participants in the act.

Fluency necessarily implies quality of performance which consists of a multiplicity of factors (this list is not exhaustive and should be considered only as an indication of the complex nature of the problem; see also Lehtonen, Sajavaara and May 1977:20-22).

Linguistic factors:

(1) phonological and phonetic factors: absence of phonetic and phonological errors, also as concerns suprasegmental features, variations in performance, mastery of perceptional cues (see Lehtonen in this volume), etc.;

(2) syntactic factors: absence of syntactic errors: capacity of generating new utterances to fulfil the communicative needs;

(3) semantic factors: awareness of the interrelationship between syntax and semantics and of the influence of extralinguistic factors on language;

(4) lexical factors: mastery of the vocabulary necessary for linguistic behaviour in a given situation (for highly relevant syntagmatic problems see Marton 1977);

(5) textual factors: sensitivity to cohesion, ellipsis, deixis, etc.

Psychological (neurological) factors:

(1) absence of phonological distortion brought about by increased breathing rate and noise caused by tension;

(2) absence of pauses and hesitation not allowed by native speakers (as a result of insufficient linguistic competence or various psychological factors such as tension or shyness).

Sociolinguistic factors:

(1) awareness of social judgments necessary for the production of acceptable utterances in a given situation;

(2) sensitivity to various sociolinguistic, cultural and environmental features including those which are based on interpersonal relationships;

(3) correct interpretation of the varieties of language and the functional values of utterance;

(4) ability to make the necessary judgments and decisions within the time constraints of the communicative situation; the limits are set by the speaker/hearer interaction, which for its part is conditioned by a complex of internal (personal and non-personal) and external parameters.

Existence or non-existence of fluency cannot be attributed to any single one of these factors or even a combination of them. Hesitation and pauses as well as false starts and rephrasings are quite natural in native-speaker performance; it is wrong to assume that a foreign-language performance would be any different. The length of the sentence is an indication of the fact that the speaker governs the generative and recursive powers of the language, which, however, is only one ingredient of fluency. The phenomena sketched above approach communicative competence: it is impossible to distinguish fluency from communicative competence.

COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE AND CA

The native language of a speaker and the foreign languages which he may speak can be regarded as parts of his communicative competence: learning a foreign language means expansion of this competence over to the area of another code. We can expand Halliday's (1975) analysis of the learning of L1 and talk about 'learning how to mean' in another code, another language. This implies that many of the parameters which were discussed in the preceding chapter remain more or less unchanged. CA should therefore be directed to elements of communicative competence which will have to be changed as compared to L1 competence to make L2 competence operative (cf. Marton 1974). Since communicative competence includes a wide range of elements which are outside grammatical competence, it is now evident that traditional CA failed to serve the purposes of applied linguistics simply for the reason that contrasting grammatical competence is highly insufficient; even if we wanted to devote our analysis to linguistic elements in CA, the results of this analysis should be correlated to the other aspects of communicative competence.

The communicative approach necessarily leads to contrastive discourse analysis. Contrasts of structures which are carried out in laboratory conditions will always remain abstractions from the applied point of view, and it is therefore necessary to study all the various factors of communication and the communicative act which make it possible, or impossible, for the participants to understand the messages. Traditional CA has been much too simple for this, and it has postulated contrasts which are far from the psycholinguistic reality of bilingual language user. The psycholinguistic contrast takes place in the form of a contact in the 'mind'

of the language learner. Moreover, the speaker and the hearer have been considered from one and the same angle: for contrastive communicative purposes, it is to be remembered that the role of the student as a speaker is highly different from his role as a hearer (see Lehtonen, Sajavaara and May 1977:16-19).

CA will have to be expanded to the following areas:

(1) *Linguistic research* is needed in various subdisciplines of linguistic analysis (phonetics, syntax, semantics, lexicon, text). It is not sufficient, however, to analyse the systems of the two languages as mere parallels. Instead, these systems will have to be brought side by side in relevant contexts for making observations on parameters which affect the intelligibility of messages in communicative situations. This implies research on the L1 and L2 discourse of the same informants and on their verbal and non-verbal communicative behaviour with native and non-native speakers of the target language concerned. The whole of the discourse must be observed, both correct and erroneous elements.[1] Particular attention should be paid to features which bring about a 'foreign accent' (see Jenner 1976).

(2) *Psycholinguistic research* (the boundary between this area and the types of research mentioned above is not categorical) will include investigations into the types of hesitation and pauses allowed in L2 discourse without the communication being twisted and into the effects of hesitation and shyness in L1 and L2, particularly as related to insufficient linguistic competence. Contrastive psycholinguistic studies of various attitudinal and emotive factors are also needed.

(3) Contrastive *sociolinguistic studies* are needed of the social decisions which a speaker-hearer is expected to make for his utterances to be acceptable in given social situations. We need contrastive information about the influence of the variation in the two languages on the language contact and about the influence of various functions of language. The roles of the speaker-hearer (including the role of the foreigner) and various norms affecting communication will have to be investigated from a contrastive angle. The time factor referred to above is an important sociolinguistic factor: we will have to investigate how

[1] For the methodology and practice of contrastive discourse analysis see Lehtonen, Sajavaara and Korpimies 1977.

much time the speakers have as conditioned by the situation and the speaker-hearer interaction in order to make decisions as regards the implementation of their communicative intentions.

CONCLUSION

Language has several ritualistic and conventional elements; such elements are easily overemphasized in foreign language teaching because of their stable character (this was clearly evident in the audiolingual method). Instead of a ritual, language should be seen the way Halliday (1975) sees it, as a potential, and language teaching should aim at a highly efficient use of this potential. This concerns the mother tongue and the foreign/second languages alike. Language was compared above to a game which may be governed differently by different people depending on their different capacities: the rules are the same for everybody but the tactics and strategies applied may differ considerably. The rules vary from language to language, and it is quite evident today that traditional CA has only scratched the surface of this complex of rules, the linguistic and communicative behaviour of the human being. CA may be criticized for this, but this does not mean that the contrastive hypothesis has no validity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alatis, J. (ed.) 1968. *Contrastive Linguistics and its Pedagogical Implications*, Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics 21, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Barrera-Vidal, A. and W. Kühlwein. 1975. *Angewandte Linguistik für den fremdsprachlichen Unterricht*, Dortmund: Lensing.

Baur, M., R.S. Baur, K.-R. Bausch, H. Brammerts, K. Kleppin, E. LÜbbert and A. Moffat. 1975. *Pragmatik und Fremdsprachenunterricht: eine rollentheoretische Pilotstudie*, Manuskripte zur Sprachlehrforschung 8, Bochum: Zentrales Fremdspracheninstitut der Ruhr-Universität Bochum.

Bausch, K.-R. 1973. Kontrastive Linguistik, in W.A. Koch (ed.) 1973, *Perspektiven der Linguistik* 1, Stuttgart: Kröner, 159-182.

Bausch, K.-R. and H. Raabe. 1975. Der Filter 'Kontrastivität' in einer Lehrergrammatik: eine Skizze der Probleme und Perspektiven, in *Beiträge und Materialen zur Ausbildung von Fremdsprachenlehrern* 2, Bochum: Zentrales Fremdspracheninstitut der Ruhr-Universität Bochum, 415-439.

Bouton, L.F. 1976. The Problem of Equivalence in Contrastive Analysis, *IRAL* 14, 143-163.

van Buren, P. 1976. Review of Krzeszowski 1974, *ISB-Utrecht* 1, 250-329.

Burgschmidt, E. and D. Götz. 1974. *Kontrastive Linguistik Deutsch/Englisch* Hueber Hochschulreihe 23. München: Hueber.

Campbell, R. and R. Wales. 1970. The Study of Language Acquisition, in J. Lyons (ed.), *New Horizons in Linguistics*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 242-260.

Chitoran, D. 1971. A Model for Second Language Acquisition, in Filipović (ed.) 1971, 173-180.

Chitoran, D. 1976. Report on the Romanian-English Contrastive Analysis Project, in Chitoran (ed.) 1976, 11-34.

Chitoran, D. (ed.) 1976. *2nd International Conference of English Contrastive Projects*, Bucharest: University Press.

Cole, P. and J.L. Morgan (eds.) 1975. *Syntax and Semantics* 3, New York: Academic Press.

Corder, S.P. 1972. Zur Beschreibung der Sprache des Sprachlerners, in Nickel (ed.) 1972, 175-184.

Corder, S.P. 1975. Error Analysis, Interlanguage and Second Language Acquisition: Survey Article, *Language Teaching & Linguistics: Abstracts* 8, 201-218.

Deszö, L. and E. Stephanides. 1976. Report on the English-Hungarian Contrastive Linguistics Project, in Chitoran (ed.) 1976, 53-58.

Di Pietro, R.J. 1971. *Language Structures in Contrast*, Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Dirven, R. 1976. A Redefinition of Contrastive Linguistics, *IRAL* 14, 1-14.

Dirven, R. and G. Radden. 1976. *Semantic Syntax of English: a Contrastive Approach*, Trier: LAUT.

Dirven, R., W. Hünig, W. Kühlwein, G. Radden and J. Strauss. 1976. *Die Leistung der Linguistik für den Englischunterricht*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Fawcett, R. 1973. Language Functions and Language Variation in a Cognitive Model of Communication. Paper presented to the AILA/BAAL seminar on 'The Communicative Teaching of English' held at Lancaster, March-April 1973.

Filipović, R. 1976. The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project from the Zagreb Conference to the Present, in Chitoran (ed.) 1976, 35-51.

Filipović, R. (ed.) 1971. *Zagreb Conference on English Contrastive Projects, 7-9 December 1970*, The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project, B.Studies, Zagreb: Institute of Linguistics.

Filipović, R. (ed.) 1974. *Pedagogical Materials* 2, The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project, Zagreb: Institute of English.

Fisiak, J. 1975. The Contrastive Analysis of Phonological Systems, *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* 22, 341-351.

Fisiak, J., M. Lipinska-Grzegorek and T. Zabrocki. 1975. *An Introductory English-Polish Contrastive Grammar*, Manuscript.

Fisiak, J. (ed.) 1975. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics* 3, Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University.

Fisiak, J. (ed.) 1976. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics* 5, Poznań, Adam Mickiewicz University.

Fries, C.C. 1945. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Golopentia-Eretescu, S. 1974. Towards a Contrastive Analysis of Conversational Strategy, in *Further Developments in Contrastive Studies*, The Romanian-English Contrastive Analysis Project, Bucharest: University Press, 79-132.

Gordon, D. and G. Lakoff. 1975. Conversational Postulates, in Cole and Morgan (eds.) 1975, 83-106.

Grice, H.P. 1975. *Logic and Conversation*, in Cole and Morgan (eds.) 1975, 41-58.

Grucza, F. 1976. Fehlerlinguistik, Lapsologie und Kontrastive Forschungen, *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* 23, 237-247.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1975. *Learning How to Mean*, London: Arnold.

Harris, Z.S. 1954. Transfer Grammar, *IRAL* 20, 259-270.

Hennig, J. and L. Huth. 1975. *Kommunikation als Problem der Linguistik*, Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht.

Jackson, H. 1976. Contrastive Linguistics – What Is It?, *ITL* 32, 1-32.

James, C. 1971. The Exculpation of Contrastive Linguistics, in Nickel (ed.) 1971, 53-68.

James, C. 1976. Review of Burgschmidt and Götz 1974, *IRAL 14*, 203-205.

Jenner, B.R.A. 1976. Interlanguage and Foreign Accent, *ISB-Utrecht 1*, 166-195.

Kellerman, E. 1977. Towards a characterization of the strategy of transfer in second language learning, *ISB-Utrecht 2*, 58-145.

König, E. 1971. Transformational Grammar and Contrastive Analysis, in Filipović (ed.) 1971, 130-145.

Kohn, K. 1976. Theoretical Aspects of Generative Contrastive Analysis, *Folia Linguistica 9*, 125-134.

Krzeszowski, T.P. 1971. Equivalence, Congruence, and Deep Structure, in Nickel (ed.) 1971, 37-48.

Krzeszowski, T.P. 1974. *Contrastive Generative Grammar: Theoretical Foundations*, Łódź: University of Łódź.

Kühlwein, W. 1975. Grundsatzfragen der kontrastiven Linguistik, *Neusprachliche Mitteilungen 28*, 80-99.

Lado, R. 1957. *Linguistics Across Cultures*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Lakoff, R. 1972. Language in Context, *Language 48*, 907-927.

Lewson, R. 1975. *Fluency and Language Teaching*, London: Longman.

Lehtonen, J., K. Sajavaara and A. May. 1977. *Spoken English: The Perception and Production of Spoken English on a Finnish-English Contrastive Basis*, Jyväskylä: Gummerus.

Lehtonen, J., K. Sajavaara and L. Korpimies. 1977. The Methodology and Practice of Contrastive Discourse Analysis, in K. Sajavaara and J. Lehtonen (eds.), *Jyväskylä Contrastive Studies 5*, Jyväskylä: Department of English.

Lipińska, M. 1975. Contrastive Analysis and the Modern Theory of Language, in Fisiak (ed.) 1975, 5-62.

Marton, W. 1968. Equivalence and Congruence in Transformational Contrastive Studies, *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia 1*, 62-63.

Marton, W. 1974. Some Remarks on the Formal Properties of Contrastive Pedagogical Grammars, in Nickel (ed.) 1974, 182-195.

Marton, W. 1977. Foreign Vocabulary Learning as Problem No. 1 of Language Teaching at the Advanced Level, *ISB-Utrecht 2*, 33-57.

Mieszek, A. (ed.) 1976. Bibliography of English-Polish Contrastive Studies in Poland, in Fisiak (ed.) 1976, 288-300.

Nickel, G. 1971. Contrastive Linguistics and Foreign-Language Teaching, in Nickel (ed.) 1971, 1-16.

Nickel, G. (ed.) 1971. *Papers in Contrastive Linguistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nickel, G. (ed.) 1972. *Reader zur kontrastiven Linguistik*, Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum Fischer.

Nickel, G. (ed.) 1974. *AILA Third Congress Copenhagen 1972 Proceedings 1*, Heidelberg: Julius Groos.

Östman, J.-O. and G. Phillips. 1977. Communicative Competence and Special Issue on Teaching and Testing Communicative Competence, *Kielikeskustelua* (Language Centre News, University of Jyväskylä), 1/1977, 11-23.

Palmberg, R. (ed.) 1976. A Select Bibliography of Error Analysis and Related Topics, *ISB-Utrecht 1*, 340-389.

Piepho, H.-E. 1974. *Kommunikative Kompetenz als übergeordnetes Lernziel im Englischunterricht*, Dornburg-Frickhofen: Frankonius-Verlag.

Rusiecki, J. 1976. The Development of Contrastive Linguistics, *ISB-Utrecht 1*, 12-44.

Sajavaara, K. (ed.) 1977. *Näkökulmia kieleen*, Suomen sovelletun kielitieteen yhdistyksen AFinLA:n julkaisuja, Helsinki: AFinLA.

Sajavaara, K. and J. Lehtonen (eds.) 1975. *A Select Bibliography of Contrastive Analysis*, Jyväskylä Contrastive Studies 1, Reports from the Department of English 1, Jyväskylä: Department of English.

Sanders, C. 1976. Recent Developments in Contrastive Analysis and their Relevance to Language Teaching, *IRAL 14*, 67-73.

Sharwood Smith, M. 1974. Contrastive Studies in Two Perspectives, in J. Fisiak (ed.), *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics 3*, Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University, 5-10.

Slama-Cazacu, T. 1971. Psycholinguistics and Contrastive Studies, in Filipović (ed.) 1971, 188-206.

Slama-Cazacu, T. 1974. The Concepts of 'Acquisition Corpus', 'Aberrant Corpus', and 'Hierarchical Systems of Errors' in Contrastive Analysis, in Nickel (ed.) 1974, 235-251.

Slama-Cazacu, T. (ed.) 1975. *The Psycholinguistic Approach in the Romanian-English Contrastive Analysis Project 1*, Bucharest: University Press.

Stickel, G. 1976. Voraussetzungen und Ziele einer kontrastiven Untersuchung des Deutschen und des Japanischen, in G. Stickel (ed.), *Deutsch-japanische Kontraste: Vorstudien zu einer kontrastiven Grammatik*, Forschungsberichte des Instituts für deutsche Sprache 29, Tübingen: TBL Verlag Gunter Narr, 3-29.

Trager, G.L. 1949. *The Field of Linguistics*, Studies in Linguistics, Occasional Papers 1, Norman, Okla.: Battenburg.

Wardhaugh, R. 1970. The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, *TESOL Quarterly* 4, 123-130.

Weinreich, U. 1953. *Languages in Contact*, Publications of the Linguistics Circle of New York 1, New York: The Linguistics Circle.

Whitman, R.L. and K.L. Jackson (eds.) 1971. *The PCCLLU Papers*, Working Papers in Linguistics 3:4, Honolulu: Department of Linguistics, University of Hawaii.

Wilkins, D. 1972. *Linguistics in Language Teaching*, London: Arnold.

Wunderlich, D. 1971. Pragmatik, Sprechsituation, Deixis, *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik 1*, 153-190.